



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,566	03/11/2004	Manish K. Deliwala	60655.8900	2565

66170 7590 03/03/2010
Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. (AMEX)
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 E. VAN BUREN STREET
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202

EXAMINER

OBEID, FAHD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/03/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

HSOBELMAN@SWLAW.COM
DMIER@SWLAW.COM
JESLICK@SWLAW.COM

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. This is in reply to communication filed on 12/07/2010.
2. No claims have been added or cancelled.
3. Claim 1 has been amended.
4. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 have been examined.

Specification Objections

5. The amendment filed 12/07/2010 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: “associating at least the following access values: a time access value, a geographic area access value, and a user-level value with at least an identifier associated with at least a portion of the internal structure within the entity” and “allocating respective billing portions of said billing to the portion of the internal structure within the entity based at least in part on said access values associated with the identifier”.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The applicant's amendment filed on 12/07/2010 contains the limitation "associating at least the following access values: a time access value, a geographic area access value, and a user-level value with at least an identifier associated with at least a portion of the internal structure within the entity" and "allocating respective billing portions of said billing to the portion of the internal structure within the entity based at least in part on said access values associated with the identifier" are considered new matter since it does not have any support in the specification. Applicant has support only for "usage time is associated with a unique identifier" (§ 38), a "geographic identifier" (§ 53), "levels of user such as if the user is a vice-president, the computing time may be allocated to corporate identifier; if the user is a programmer, the computing time may be allocated to a particular project" (§ 47). Applicant does not have support for associating a single identifier with the access values.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3627

Claim 1 recites the limitations “associating at least the following access values: a time access value, a geographic area access value, and a user-level value with at least an identifier associated with at least a portion of the internal structure within the entity” and “allocating respective billing portions of said billing to the portion of the internal structure within the entity based at least in part on said access values associated with the identifier” are vague and indefinite. It is unclear and confusing how possible is it to associate “a time access value”, “a geographic area access value”, and “a user-level access value” with at least an identifier. Applicant specification describes “usage time is associated with a unique identifier” (§ 38), a “geographic identifier” (§ 53), “levels of user such as if the user is a vice-president, the computing time may be allocated to corporate identifier; if the user is a programmer, the computing time may be allocated to a particular project” (§ 47). Therefore, if each of the access values have its own independent identifier, then how is it possible to associate the “time access value”, “geographic area access value”, and “user-level access value” with at least an identifier. Thus the limitation is not positively recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

Art Unit: 3627

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-4, and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacFarlane (US 6,125,354) in view of Peterson (US 7,020,628).

12. Regarding Claim 1: MacFarlane discloses a method for facilitating the allocation of a billing incurred by an entity from a technology resource provider, said method comprising:

- receiving a business model (organization hierarchy) file corresponding to an internal structure of the entity, the business model file including at least one application profile associating at least the following access values (col 1 lns 27-42, col 3 lns 54-63, and col 4 lns 6-8):
 - a time access value (col 2 lns 58-62)
 - a geographic area access value (fig.1 and col 3 lns 21-25)
 - and a user-level value with at least an identifier associated with at least a portion of the internal structure within the entity (fig.5 and col 6 lns 57-64);
- receiving said billing, which includes data corresponding to usage of at least one technology resource by the entity and data corresponding to said access values (col 6 lns 17-20 and col 8 lns 49-58).
- allocating respective billing portions of said billing to the portion of the internal structure within the entity based at least in part on said access values associated with the identifier,

Art Unit: 3627

said billing portions corresponding to usage of said at least one technology resource by the portion of the internal structure within the entity (col 2 lns 58-67, col 6 lns 57-59, and col 9 lns 25-35).

MacFarlane does not explicitly disclose a time access value.

However, Peterson does disclose a time access value (fig.2, col 4 lns 5-10, and col 5 lns 18-24)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Peterson's teachings in MacFarlane's "system and method for generating an invoice charges to the elements of an organization" enabled, for the advantage of monitoring the costs of remote users accessing the host computer or computer network of the company, in addition to tracking the usage of computer time and various costs associated with that time (Peterson; col 1 lns 27-30).

13. Regarding Claim 3: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein receiving said business model file further includes receiving said business model file at a controller (figs 1-4, col 1 lns 27-42, and col 3 lns 54-63).

14. Regarding Claim 4: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further including automatically recognizing at least one user (figs. 2-4 and col 8 lns 26-34).

Art Unit: 3627

15. Regarding Claim 6: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 4, wherein said allocating further includes allocating loyalty points to the at least one user (figs. 2-4 and col 8 lns 26-34).

16. Regarding Claim 7: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein said allocating further includes reducing said billing by a monetary value of loyalty points (figs. 2-4 and col 8 lns 26-34).

17. Regarding Claim 8: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein said allocating further includes at least one of transferring, pooling and gifting loyalty points (figs. 2-4 and col 8 lns 26-28).

18. Regarding Claim 9: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further including providing a descriptive billing statement including at least a portion of said business model file (fig.1, col 4 lns 45-48, and col 7 lns 10-14).

19. Regarding Claim 11: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further including adjusting said billing based upon at least one of a CPU-second used, a total CPU-seconds expected to be used, a volume discount, a stepped-type of pricing, a peak/off-peak usage, a geographic location, a service provided, a performance expectation, a location, a service level scoring, a CPU cycle, a local power consumption cost, a physical site security, an increased site security, an additional operational procedure needed to support increased sensitive data, a level of fail over needed, a service level agreement, and an account data privacy requirement (figs 2-4,

Art Unit: 3627

abstract, and claim 1).

20. Regarding Claim 12: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further comprising:

21. determining said internal structure, including various groups and sub-groups within said entity (col 1 lns 27-35); determining a billing detail of said group within said entity (fig.1, col 4 lns 45-48, and col 7 lns 10-14); determining a value driver of said entity (claim 1); and determining an application profile of said entity (col 4 lns 6-8).

22. Regarding Claim 17: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 13, further including performing data analysis of said computer usage using the at least one application performance driver (fig.1, col 5 lns 1-12, and claim 4).

23. Regarding Claim 18: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 13, further including suggesting a cost efficient usage practice (col 1 lns 42-46 and col 1 lns 61-65).

24. Regarding Claim 19: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 13, further including requesting a bid based upon said monitoring step (col 3 lns 31-40).

25. Regarding Claim 20: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein said business model file further includes at least one of an application profile, a value driver, a user level, a geographic area, a project, a zone, a third party provider, loyalty information and a rule (col 3 lns 31-40 and col 4 lns 1-8).

26. Regarding Claims 2, 10, and 13-16: MacFarlane does not explicitly disclose a computer usage includes computing time obtained from an outsourced provider, monitoring computer usage, and notifying at least one user of said computer usage.

However, Peterson does disclose a method of claim 1 wherein said technology resources includes at least one of computer usage, wherein said computer usage includes computing time obtained from an outsourced provider, telephony resource usage, manufacturing cycles and production runs (col 1 lns 17-18 and col 4 lns 7-10); Monitoring said computer usage (col 1 lns 46-50); notifying the at least one user of said computer usage (col 5 lns 10-15).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Peterson's teachings in MacFarlane's "system and method for generating an invoice charges to the elements of an organization" enabled, for the advantage of monitoring the costs of remote users accessing the computer of the company (Peterson; col 1 lns 27-29).

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular the applicant argues that: a) MacFarlane in view of Peterson do not suggest or teach "associating at least the following access values: a time access value, a geographic area access value, and a user-level value with at least an identifier associated with at least a portion of the internal structure within the entity".

In response to a) examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. MacFarlane teaches allocating billed charges to elements of the organization and to adjust the allocated charges on a charge by charge and element by element basis (col 2 lns 64-67). Allocating the billed charges to the appropriate elements, i.e. divisions, branches, departments, etc. (col 3 lns 21-26). A user code is used to indicate the element or hierarchical level of the organization to which the charges are to be allocated (fig.5 and col 6 lns 57-64). Furthermore, MacFarlane teaches allocating charges based on geographical location identifier such as western region or eastern region, if eastern region is selected then the areas within the eastern region are displayed for a narrow selections such as states (geographic area access value) which is associated with an organization hierarchy such as accounting, human resources, or payroll (internal structure of the entity) (fig.1 and col 4 lns 1-8). Therefore, the geographic locations are associated with an identifier and are associated with an organization hierarchy such as corporation branches. Peterson further teaches a billing computer can use a unique pass code each user possesses to distribute the minutes of use (col 4 lns 37-38). Therefore, the combination of MacFarlane in view of Peterson still meet the scope of the limitation as currently claimed.

Conclusion

28. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3627

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAHD A. OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
February 20, 2010

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627